CR 08-70183 JCS

1

1 //
2 ag

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

agreed that, taking into account the public interest in prompt disposition of criminal cases, good cause existed for this extension.

On May 30, 2008, the parties appeared before the Court for another status conference. At that time, the parties requested, and the Court agreed, to set a status conference on June 20, 2008 to schedule the date for the defendant's preliminary hearing and arraignment. The parties further stipulated that pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure ("FRCP") 5.1(d), the time limits set forth in FRCP 5.1(c) be excluded from May 30, 2008, through June 20, 2008. The parties agreed that, taking into account the public interest in prompt disposition of criminal cases, good cause exists for this extension.

The defendant also agrees to exclude, from May 7, 2008 through May 30, 2008, and from May 30, 2008 through June 20, 2008, any time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The parties represented to the Court that the length of the continuances mentioned above was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting those continuances outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

19

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney

21

DATED: May 30, 2008

23

22

TAREK J. HELOU
Assistant United States Attorney

24

DATED: May 30, 2008 /s/

25 26

GEOFFREY HANSEN
Attorney for Defendant Margaret Pek Hoon Lim

27

28

For the reasons stated above, the Court finds that exclusion of time from May 7, 2008

through May 30, 2008 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A); FRCP 5.1(d). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

The Court also finds that exclusion of time from May 30, 2008 through June 20, 2008 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A); FRCP 5.1(d). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 6/2/08

